DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 298 647 EA 020 323

AUTHOR Su, Zhixin
TITLE Teacher Education Reform in the United States (1890-1986). Occasional Paper No. 3.
INSTITUTION Washington Univ., Seattle. Center for Educational Renewal.
PUB DATE May 86
NOTE 60p.
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (120) -- Information Analyses (070)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Educational History; Elementary Secondary Education; Foundations of Education; Higher Education; Preservice Teacher Education; *Schools of Education; Teacher Certification; *Teacher Education; *Teacher Education Curriculum; *Teacher Education Programs; Teacher Qualifications; Teacher Supervision; Teaching (Occupation)

ABSTRACT

This paper reviews the major studies and reports about the development and reform of teacher education over the past century, focusing on the chronic issues and recurring themes in this body of literature. Part 1 reviews the historical development of teacher education in America over four periods: advancement and transformation from normal schools to teachers' colleges (1890-1930); construction and consolidation of teacher education institutions (1930-1950); controversy and criticism over teacher education (1950-1970); and research, reform, and reconstruction of teacher education (1970 to the present). Part 2 focuses on literature that pertains to the following chronic issues and recurring themes: (1) teaching as a profession; (2) organization of knowledge; (3) organization of programs; (4) quality controls; (5) authority and responsibility; and (6) state-certified departments of education and public schools. Seventy-three references are included. (TE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. Goodlad

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ED298647

EA 020 323

Center for Educational Renewal

TEACHER EDUCATION REFORM IN THE UNITED STATES (1890-1986)

ZHIXIN SU

Occasional Paper No. 3

May 1986

OCCASIONAL PAPER SERIES

Institute for the Study of Educational Policy
College of Education
University of Washington
Seattle, Washington 98195

TEACHER EDUCATION REFORM IN THE UNITED STATES (1890-1986)

ZHIXIN SU

Occasional Paper No. 3

May 1986

CONTENTS

Page

INTRODUCTION. i

PREFACE 1

PART I. HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT: MAJOR REFORM EFFORTS FROM 1890 TO THE PRESENT 3

1890-1930: Advancement and Transformation 4

1930-1950: Construction and Consolidation 7

1950-1970: Controversy and Criticism 8

1970-the Present: Research, Reform and Reconstruction 12

PART II. CHRONIC ISSUES AND RECURRING THEMES 17

Teaching as a Profession 17

Organization of Knowledge 22

Organization of Programs 29

Quality Controls 36

Authority and Responsibility 42

SCDEs and Public Schools 44

CONCLUDING NOTE 47

REFERENCES 49

INTRODUCTION

Occasional Paper No. 1 describes three interrelated activities of the Center for Educational Renewal, all directed toward the simultaneous improvement of schooling and the education of educators. One of these three involves a comprehensive examination of conditions and circumstances pertaining to the education of teachers, counselors, special educators, and administrators. I asked one of my colleagues in the center, Zhixin Su, to provide us with a historical backdrop regarding issues in the proposals for the improvement of teacher education over the past century. Occasional Paper No. 3 represents a substantive part of her work.

Ms. Su's paper is organized around major studies, books, and commission reports. Her summaries and analyses provide us with a quite clear picture of the context of the documents, context that she categorizes so as to suggest trends in concerns over successive periods of time to the present.

Many of the proposals and recommendations appearing in the documents reviewed appear to be eminently sensible; and many are repeated in successive reports, sometimes more vigorously than before. Parts of Ms. Su's documentation suggest that proposals and the rationales for them often became the subject matter for intensive dialogue which, in turn, usually involved highly visible, respected educational leaders. Yet, there appears not to have been resolution and, subsequently, implementation in many significant areas of debate--or else why the serial recurrence of virtually identical proposals?

This question interests us deeply and, no doubt, will arise frequently as we pursue the issues and problems of the teacher education enterprise. Is significant improvement not possible? Are the problems so complex and persistent that small, incremental improvements over the years are deemed by the writers to be not adequate? Or, is the whole, "An Unstudied Problem in Education," to use the sub-title of The Preparation of Teachers by Seymour Sarason and his associates (revised edition, 1986)? By "studied" they mean knowing and experiencing "in the most intimate and tangible ways the situation which your actions purport to affect." In this sense, the enterprise has been unstudied, I fear.

The interest in teacher education is once again high--probably even higher than it was in the years immediately following Sputnik. We hope that this interest will lead to knowledge-based understanding of the culture of the enterprise and actions that reflect such understanding. My colleagues and I are embarked on work intended to enlarge on this understanding. Occasional Paper No. 3 is a step in this direction.

John I. Goodlad
Professor and Director,
Center for Educational Renewal

PREFACE

Since the founding of the first normal school in 1837, teacher education in the U.S. has grown into the largest enterprise within American higher education. Today, 1,340 colleges and universities, or more than 80 percent of all four-year colleges and universities in the U.S., prepare educators; and more than one-third of all bachelor's degrees granted each year by these institutions go to those who intend to become teachers.

As is the case with the Common School Ideal and practice, teacher education in the U.S. has always been associated with the ideal of democracy. It is regarded as the most important element in determining the success of the American public-school system, which makes possible the literate and informed citizenship fundamental to a democracy (U.S.O.E., 1933).

Americans in general have held great expectations for teachers: they should have lofty ambitions and rational ideals, possess good personal qualities and sound general scholarship, love and understand children, and function as model democratic citizens and community leaders (Hanus, 1907; Luckey, 1915; Woodring, 1957).

However, in reality, the status of teaching and teacher education is not as impressive as the quantitative statistics associated with it, nor is it comparable to the high-sounding rhetoric on its front stage. That is why, throughout the past hundred years, continual efforts have been made

to enhance the teaching profession and to reform teacher education in America.

In this paper, I shall attempt to review the major studies and reports about teacher education reform in the U.S. in the past 10 decades. Special attention will be given to the chronic issues and recurring themes in this body of literature. Meanwhile, I shall identify and discuss some of the new directions in reform and consider their implications for the future of the teaching profession and teacher education.

PART I

Historical Development:

Major Reform Efforts from 1890 to the Present

For the convenience of the review and discussion, I shall divide the development of teacher education in America in the past hundred years into four periods, each of which has its own characteristics: (1) 1890-1930: advancement and transformation from normal schools to teachers colleges; (2) 1930-1950: construction and consolidation of teacher education institutions; (3) 1950-1970: controversy and criticism over teacher education; and (4) 1970-the present: research, reform, and reconstruction of teacher education. The reason for leaving out of my discussion the earlier years (1837-1890) of teacher education in America is that I consider those years as being largely formative rather than reformative. Teacher educators in the earlier years were mainly concerned with the definition of the function of normal schools (See, for example, Commissioner of Common Schools in Ohio, 1866), and with the establishment of instructional programs for teacher education (Committee on Normal Schools, 1884). Of course, even during those formative years, arguments over what was academic instruction and what was professional knowledge, whether there should be unified standards of admission, etc., were unavoidable among scholars.

1890-1930: Advancement and Transformation

American teacher education went through a substantial transformation in the years between 1890 and 1930 when the rapid development of the free public high school resulted in the advancement of normal schools to four-year, degree-granting teachers colleges. Understanding this historical transformation is essential to the interpretation of the problems facing teacher education at that time. As Smith (1980) points out, the movement to upgrade the normal school ended in the demise of the single-purpose, autonomous, professional school for the education of teachers, and in the emergence of dual-purpose teachers colleges.

With the transformation, the traditional thought that teachers were "born, not made" was no longer taken for granted. Three major elements of teacher training--academic studies, professional studies, and practice teaching--began to take their shape (Tarbell, 1895). The first significant reform of the teacher education curriculum was made by James E. Russell when he became dean of Teachers College in 1898. He believed that general culture, special scholarship, professional knowledge, and technical skill were the four components essential to success in teaching. We shall see that for nearly a century following Russell's reform, American teacher education programs have evolved more or less around these four components, and they vary very little from institution to institution. In 1977, when talking about the education of the educating profession, Lawrence Cremin still believed that he could do no better than to take Russell's four components and reformulate them into present-day terms. Russell also

raised admission standards, lengthened the course of study, and formed alliances with state departments of education and professional associations.

Perhaps the first survey report on teacher education in America is The Professional Preparation of Teachers for American Public Schools (1920) by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. The inquiry was inspired by the foundation's 1910 report on medical education in America. It began with an examination of the agencies for the training of teachers in the state of Missouri, although the authors were concerned with normal schools throughout the U.S. The facts reported were quite disturbing: admission standards were low, courses and instructional staffs were in bad shape, and credentials were granted on wholly arbitrary grounds. The report made numerous and detailed recommendations for reform, including consolidation of all teacher-training institutions under a single board, devotion of the normal school to a single purpose of professional instruction, and reorganization of curricula. Many of these recommendations cannot help being ambiguous because the report constantly swings from the state of Missouri to the U.S. in general. Some scholars judge the report to be non-scientific because there seems to be little or no grounds other than the authority of the authors for many of the positions taken (Judd, 1920). Nevertheless, the report was recognized at once as a most useful handbook for teacher educators and for classes in education.

Toward the end of the transformation period, a group of scholars, led by W. W. Charters and Douglas Waples of the University of Chicago, launched

an extensive and thorough exploration in teachers' traits and educators' activities. They analyzed more than 200,000 statements by teachers, isolated 25 most important teachers' traits, and summarized 1,010 teachers' activities which were classified into six categories: instruction, management, extra classroom activities, administrative relations, personal and professional advancement, and activities concerning supplies and plant. The study, which came out under the title of Commonwealth Teacher-Training Study (1929), intended to build a basis for developing a functional pedagogical curriculum. Today, some educators still regard it as the only comprehensive and objective effort to provide a functional basis for pedagogical education (Smith, 1980). However, it has been largely forgotten by most people. The major deficiency of the study is that its descriptions of teachers' traits and activities are much too detailed, to the extend of becoming redundant and trivial. For example, under the trait of "cleanliness," the authors list seven details: (a) keeps clothes clean and well pressed, (b) keeps hands and nails clean, (c) keeps teeth in good condition, (d) keeps body clean, (e) requires pupils to keep their desks clean, (f) washes faces when they need washing, and (g) keeps desk clean (p. 226). All these could be succinctly put in one sentence: keep yourself in good shape and well groomed, and keep the teaching and learning environment clean and healthy. One can hardly blame those educators who prefer not to study these trivial points and make them useful in the research and teaching activities.

1930-1950: Construction and Consolidation

This period witnessed some conscientious efforts to construct and consolidate the transformed teacher education institutions. The U.S. Office of Education took the lead and conducted in the early 1930s perhaps the most extensive national survey ever made of the education of educators. The topics covered in the six voluminous survey reports include history, principles and problems of teacher education, identification of unity and diversity in curriculum organization in various types of institutions (urban, rural, "negro," etc.), comparison of American teacher education with the teacher training programs in major European countries, and detailed recommendations for improvement, with the competence in the skills of teaching as a primary objective. The survey staff also compiled a very thorough annotated bibliography on the education of teachers in America before 1933. Comprehensive as it is, the sheer volume of the survey report--1,783 pages altogether--may have scared away many eager but often too busy educators, thus diminishing its importance and usefulness. In this university, I seem to be the second person in the past ten years to take a peek behind its covers. Such national surveys may receive more attention and be made more useful in highly centralized countries like China and the Soviet Union.

Another major study made during this period in teacher education construction and reform was done by the Commission on Teacher Education of the American Council on Education in the 1940s. Eight reports resulted from the study. Improvement of Teacher Education (1946), the concluding report,

summarizes the commission's experience and contains its recommendations with regard to various aspects of teacher education. The main purpose of the commission was to articulate the relationship between democracy and teacher education, to sensitize teacher training institutions to the social realities and ideals, to stimulate institutions to improve their programs, and to promote interinstitutional cooperation.

1950-1970: Controversy and Criticism

These two decades perhaps constitute the most turbulent period in American teacher education development and reform. It began with a heated debate over the liberal and the technical nature, function, and components of teacher education. Many academic scholars by then had gained the impression that professional educators were too preoccupied with professional training to have any real interest in liberal education of teachers, while some professors of education started to criticize their colleagues in the academic departments for their opposition to professional education for teachers.

Several scholars stood out as the forerunners in this battle of controversy. Bestor, in his The Restoration of Learning (1955), discussed the distribution of power over teacher education, and expounded the relationship between the liberal and the vocational in teacher training. He took the position that a four-year liberal education was the necessary prerequisite for any professional training, and that the high-standard of knowledge

was the key to improving teaching as a profession. Borrowman, in his carefully documented study The Liberal and Technical in Teacher Education (1956), focused on the search for balance between two educational functions, and analyzed different views that had arisen over such issues as the stress on a technical, as opposed to a philosophical, approach to the professional sequence, and the development of laboratory-experience programs in opposition to the traditional apprenticeship approach to student teaching.

The debate over the liberal and the technical actually reflected two traditions of teacher education in the U.S. One was the academic or liberal arts view representing those in preparing teachers for secondary schools, and the other was that of the normal-school professional educators whose main focus was on elementary school teacher training. The teacher education formed in the university schools of education was, as Woodring (1957) observed, an "unsuccessful marriage" of the two which had failed to synthesize the two philosophies. The end result of the controversy in the 1950s seemed to be a victory for the liberal arts proponents. In general, reformers permitted the liberal to overwhelm the technical on the ground that there was so little substance to pedagogy that the basic education of teachers should be in liberal arts and sciences, followed by apprenticeship in the trade.

In addition to the debate over the liberal and the technical in teacher education, scholars in the 1950s began to search for the true meanings of education as a profession. In a study of this nature, Education as a

Profession (1956), Lieberman carefully examined the status of education as related to that of other professions, discussed the existing practices and problems from both the historical and the clinical points of view, and proposed constructive recommendations for professional improvement. The psychological, legal, administrative, and organizational problems of professionalization were analyzed, and the importance of each teacher taking an active role in the process of professionalization was stressed.

The launching of Sputnik in 1957 turned another new leaf in the history of American education. The whole nation directed its attention and blame to public schools, and from there, further down to teacher training institutions. This situation gave great impetus to educational reformers. They plunged themselves into a pains-taking search for new directions in teacher education. In the report, New Horizons for the Teaching Profession, sponsored by the National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards (1961), the reformers examined the status and responsibilities of the teaching profession; discussed problems in pre- and in-service education, accreditation, certification, admission, retention policies and procedures; and proposed plans for action at local, state, and national levels. Unfortunately, the report neglected the fundamental conditions that hampered the development of teacher education and the teaching profession.

Perhaps the most noticeable study in teacher education in the 1960s was James B. Conant's report The Education of American Teachers (1963). Backed by the Carnegie Corporation, Conant conducted a two-year study of the broad

programs of teacher education in 77 institutions across the U.S. The report contains Conant's observations and recommendations about certification, academic preparation of teachers, theory and practice of teaching, course requirements, and personnel. Smith (1980) commented that although Conant's study was similar to Flexner's study of medical education, it made little more than a ripple on the surface of pedagogical education because Conant had neither the financial support nor the backing of the organized profession, both of which Flexner enjoyed. Nevertheless, Conant's study was very thought provoking, and full of hopes for the betterment of the teaching profession.

At the same time of Conant's study, a similar, but very different in tone, study of teacher education, The Miseducation of American Teachers (1963), was conducted by James D. Koerner. Although he delivered vigorous criticism of the poor academic content and conditions of teacher training and provided speculations and recommendations, his scathing sarcasm and pessimism which pervaded the whole book must have dampened many readers' hope for the reconstrution of teacher education. Koerner employed the "straw-man" strategy in his discussion. He cited shocking examples--poor spelling of some education students, some education administrators' ignorance of some famous works, etc. (examples that can be found in any profession and professional education), exaggerated their effects, then made generalizations from these isolated facts. Koerner's pessimism persisted with him into the 1970s. When discussing the governance of teacher education in 1973, he asserted that no genuinely new directions

were possible in teacher education and that all the reform efforts, breakthroughs, sweeping changes, and revolutions were simply nonsense. This was a denial of his own reform attempts in the 1960s as well.

1970--The Present: Research, Reform, and Reconstruction

In this most recent period, conscientious research into the knowledge of teaching and meaningful dialogues on teacher education reconstruction have been developed. The new era has witnessed the gradual maturity of the teaching profession and the profession's as well as the public's increasing commitment to the reform of teacher education. New Perspectives on Teacher Education by Donald J. McCarty and his associates (1973) accurately predicted the trends in teacher education reform in the 1970s and 1980s: the continuation of the quarrel over the liberal and the professional aspects of teacher education, the development and application of the performance-based and other models for teacher training, the bottom-up approach and other paradigms for change, the increasing collaboration between school and university, and the persistent search for knowledge about teaching and learning.

Some impressive progress has been made in the exploration of the knowledge base of pedagogical education. NSSE's 74th Yearbook Teacher Education (1975) examined some of the perplexing and pressing problems of pedagogical education and summarized what we knew about pedagogy. In 1978, Gage took a big step in this area of research, and argued convincingly in his The

Scientific Basis of the Art of Teaching that there were some process variables that promised a significant correlation with desirable outcome variables.

Another big step taken in this direction in 1980 was the careful design for a school of pedagogy by one of America's most experienced teacher educators, B. O. Smith, who gave primary consideration to the knowledge base of pedagogical education, and systematically examined the nature, types, and uses of pedagogical knowledge. He drew a blueprint for a professional school of pedagogy and discussed ways to bring about the changes proposed. It would be interesting to find out if any teacher training institutions have tried to model this design and what are the problems and prospects.

Perhaps the most recent discussion on the knowledge base of teaching is contained in Essential Knowledge for Beginning Educators (Smith, 1983). The twelve papers in the volume concentrate on research into generic and essential components of pre-service preparation programs. These elements were identified as instructional planning, management of instruction, management of student conduct, context variables, diagnosis and measurement, and evaluation. It is still too early to examine the effects of the proposed programs.

The other major focus of research and reform in recent years is on improving teaching as a profession and effecting changes in the education of educators. Some of the most important reform studies and reports are as follows:

1. Educating a Profession (Howsam et al., 1976). This study covers not only the classical topics of teaching as a profession and the preparation programs of teachers, but also current issues regarding the governance of teacher education and the control of quality.

2. A Study of Teacher Education Institutions as Innovators, Knowledge Producers and Change Agencies (Clark and Guba, 1977). This study analyzed the resulting data of an investigation into 135 schools, colleges, and departments of education (SCDEs) and delineates the roles SCDEs play or might be expected to play in knowledge production and utilization in education.

3. "The Phoenix Agenda: Essential Reform in Teacher Education" (Joyce and Clift, 1984). An ideal teaching profession is illustrated in this study and the study provides insight into structural and curricular reforms in teacher education.

4. Who Will Teach Our Children? (California Commission on the Teaching Profession, 1985). Serving as a strategy for improving California's schools, the study emphasizes the need to restructure the teaching career and to redesign the school as a more productive workplace for teachers and students.

5. "A Call for Change in Teacher Education" (National Commission for Excellence in Teacher Education, 1985). This study reaffirms the relationship between education and democracy, offers a vision of a professional teacher who can lead to the transformation of the schools

and enrich the lives of young people, and recommends to policy makers and college and university leaders ways to improve teacher education.

6. Tomorrow's Teachers (The Holmes Group, 1986). The report, which is the result of almost three years of debate, recognizes differences in teachers' knowledge, skill, and commitment in their education, certification, and work. It advocates a three-tiered staffing pattern for teachers and calls for making schools better places for teachers to work and to learn. It also calls for moving teacher preparation to the graduate level.

7. A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century (Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy, 1986). This most recent report on teacher education reform has been hailed as a bold challenge to policy makers to empower teachers to enable them to set higher standards and assume responsibility for certifying those who will teach. Like the Holmes Group report, it also recommends moving teacher preparation to the graduate level, and calls for restructuring the teaching career (by differentiated staffing) and the teaching place (by creating a professional environment in schools).

These new studies and reports have provided American educators and the general public with some deeper understanding of the status of teaching and teacher education, and a splendid agenda for thinking and action. However, although each of these reform studies has its own depth and merit, there seems to be a lack of comprehensive interpretations of the past and the

present, and wholistic visions for the future. We need a more substantial study that can encompass all of the past interpretations and visions, yet take them a step further toward genuine reform. Such a study would require both qualitative and quantitative research, cooperative efforts from all parties concerned, and a deeper level of analysis that addresses the question of why some issues and recommendations have shown up time and again in the past.

For the purpose of such an inquiry, it may be helpful to look more closely at some of the major recurring topics in American teacher education reform: teaching as a profession, organization of knowledge, organization of programs, quality controls, authority and responsibility, and relationship between SCDEs and public schools. Part II of this paper will be devoted to the discussion of these six issues in light of the reform literature in the past ten decades.

PART II

Chronic Issues and Recurring Themes

Teaching as a Profession

In most cases, the head-on issue that a teacher education reformer has to deal with is to define what is a profession and to examine whether teaching qualifies as a profession.

American educators' conception of a "profession" was relatively simple at the turn of the century: a profession implied inherent merit, a training garnered at great effort and expense, and popular recognition awarded those who through effort had attained marked success in their chosen field of work (Edson, 1899). Later on, the conception was expanded to include the following characteristics: competition and standards (U.S.O.E., 1933), an extensive body of knowledge, a grasp of certain intellectual processes, and a personality that commands respect and admiration (Bestor, 1955); a broad range of autonomy and responsibility, an emphasis upon the service to be rendered, and a code of ethics (Lieberman, 1956); a liberally educated man, and a continuing search for new knowledge and skill (Lindsey, 1961); a lifetime commitment to competence, and a high-level of public trust and respect (Howsam et al., 1976[1]).

---

[1]Howsam and his associates also defined twelve characteristics of "semi-professions," which were similar to those of a "profession, but prefixed with such modifiers as "lower," "shorter," "less," "little," "lack," and "absence." They observed that teaching was often construed as a "semi-profession" rather than a profession.

The task of finding out whether teaching is a profession has proved to be more difficult and complicated. The concept of teaching as a profession was close to the surface as early as 1827, and it probably expressed the consensus of educators when it was made official in the chapter of the National Education Association (NEA) in 1870 (Borrowman, 1971). It was the American normal school that established the ideal that teaching should command the prestige and commitment to service usually characterized as "professional."

However, educators' declaration of teaching as a profession does not necessarily make it a profession in the public's eyes. The early reformers must have recognized the gap between rhetoric and reality, for by the end of the last century, some of the ways and means by which teachers might grow professionally were proposed:

> By cultivating a spirit of enthusiasm; by thought and study; by a careful study of the child; by reading educational books, journals and reports; by attending teachers' associations, institutes and summer schools; by school visitation; and by an acquaintance with prominent school men and women. (Edson, 1899, 131-136)

Although this early recommendation was rather simple, it carried the author's sincere hope to build a strong teaching profession.

Unfortunately, the gap between rhetoric and reality seems to become widened in the 20th century. In the 1930s, the scholars who conducted the national survey of the education of teachers discovered that while teaching was a profession in Europe, the statement was only half true in America.

This was because the conditioning factors for the maintenance of a profession--high selective qualifications for admission, long and difficult course of training, adequate compensation, economic security, and social prestige--prevailed for teaching in the leading countries of Europe but did not exist in most of the states in America (U.S.O.E., 1933). By the 1950s, some reformers believed that they had found the key barrier to the professionalization of teaching--lack of power and personal responsibility on the part of teachers. Lieberman (1956) claimed that teachers would remain in the status of hired hands rather than professional workers if they were to continue to be subject to the orders of an administrator whom they had not chosen, who was not responsible to them, and over whom they had no control. Thus, he called for more power and greater autonomy for the teachers, although he found that many teachers were often unwilling to accept responsibilities commensurate with professional autonomy and increased power.

The prospect of teaching as a profession has not become any brighter in the recent decades. Although teachers in general share the conviction that teaching by its very nature is a profession, teaching is seen by many in the public as but a partial profession or pseudoprofession, resting on experiences and apprenticeship rather than on sound theories and ideas. John I. Goodlad (1984) has delineated this dilemma:

> In general the practising teacher . . . functions in a context where the beliefs and expectations are those of a profession but where the realities tend to constrain, likening actual practice more to a trade. (p. 193)

This dilemma may also explain why teaching and teacher education is neither appreciated nor honored in American society. As the popular joke goes, "those who can perform some useful work do so; those who cannot work, teach; those who cannot teach, teach teachers" (McCarty, 1973). The American public's low respect for educationists seems to have formed a vicious circle that effectively reinforces the low status and poor quality of teaching and teacher education. Koerner (1963) summarizes one's principal impression of educationists as that of a "sincere, humanitarian, well-intentioned, hard-working, poorly informed, badly educated, and ineffectual group of men and women" (p. 37).

In addition, educationists themselves often have low self-esteem, which has resulted in a self-fulfilling prophecy: the assignment of inferior status to professional education (Howsam et al., 1976), and in a circular problem: "a weak faculty operates a weak program that attracts weak students" (Koerner, 1963, 242). Calls for breaking these vicious cycles have been voiced throughout the years, from the promotion of a nation-wide systematic campaign to develop an understanding of the significance of education and teachers in a democracy (U.S.O.E., 1933), to the proposal of establishing a National Academy for Teacher Education which would carry symbolic and functional values (National Commission for Excellence in Teacher Education, 1985). But have they made any real progress in improving teachers' status and prestige?

Probably not. This is not because campaigns and symbolic establishments are unimportant, but because problems of teaching as a profession are

often deeply rooted in the conditions and circumstances of teaching. The ill conditions under which too many teachers carry on their work were identified at the beginning of this century: stress and strain of a deadening routine for small pay, an unappreciative public, narrow or ill-bred official superiors, etc. (Hanus, 1908; Boykin, 1914). There is a great contradiction between the intellectual nature of teaching and the isolated, non-scholarly, and non-self renewing character of the setting in which teaching takes place.

Throughout the century, these ill conditions have remained almost unchanged and in some cases even become worse, although nearly every major reform report recognizes them and makes recommendations to improve them. In recent years, some careful studies have been conducted on the setting for teaching. It is recognized that any effort to reform teacher education must be coupled with systematic efforts to reform the structure of teaching and the work lives of teachers (Schlechty and Vance, 1981). After analyzing the various reasons for teachers' frustration and dissatisfaction in schools as work-places, Goodlad (1984) asserts that the circumstances of teaching must change (reduce the instructional time, etc.) to provide optimum opportunity for teaching and learning to proceed, and for initiating school-based progress of curricular and instructional improvement shared by the entire staff. One hopeful measure to improve the conditions and circumstances of teaching is to create differentiated staffing and salaries (see, for example, Gideonse, 1982; Kerr, 1983; Goodlad, 1984). This may help change the careerless sense and nature of elementary and secondary school teaching.

It is worth noting here that although teaching as a profession is largely an unresolved issue for school teachers, it seems to be taken for granted by college and university professors. Some professors may be more willing to identify themselves as members of the profession of their specialty, but most do not disagree that university teaching is their life-long career and profession. Unfortunately, many professors do not regard school teachers as fellow members of the same teaching profession. It can be predicted that school teachers still have a long way to go before they can self-actualize into the teaching profession. University professors can play an important role in helping school teachers to achieve this goal.

Organization of Knowledge

It is generally agreed that a profession should possess a common body of knowledge and a repertoire of behaviors and skills for the practice of the profession, and that such knowledge should serve as the organizing focus of professional education. Furthermore, an occupation becomes a profession only when its members make a substantial proportion of their decisions on the basis of professional lore.

For the American teachers, as early as in 1900, the definition of a profession came to include the idea that a specialized body of knowledge was required of its members (Borrowman, 1965). However, nearly a century has passed, and the teaching profession in America today is still being criticised for its lack of an essential body of knowledge and skills. A

serious teacher education reformer thus cannot avoid encountering this chronic issue.

One explanation for this problem is that many people today, as their ancestors yesterday and the day before yesterday, still believe that teachers are born, not made; and that teaching has always been based upon conventional wisdom, folkways, and personal experience rather than upon solidly validated professional knowledge and skills.

As compared with some other professions (law, medicine, etc.), there seems to be no esoteric knowledge for pedagogy. A person definitely cannot be a doctor or a lawyer without going through some professional training, but a person probably can still be a teacher without going through any teacher training. In some countries (for example, in China), many school teachers are simply graduates from general programs in colleges without any special training in teaching, yet they often teach as well or as badly as those who are graduates of normal schools and colleges. Even in the U.S., where measurements of teaching competence are well advanced, one can detect little difference between an uncertified teacher who has not taken teaching methods courses and a certified teacher who has taken the full requirement (The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, 1973). In a study of education students' expectations for teacher education, Book, Byers, and Freeman (1983) discovered that almost 90 percent of the candidates came to formal teacher preparation believing that they have little to learn. Such entering attitudes reflect the strength of the lore that there is little need to obtain a knowledge base in pedagogy in order to become an effective

teacher. Some renowned scholars also deny the need for professional training in teaching. Robert M. Hutchins (1940) claimed that "All there is to teaching can be learned through a good education and being a teacher" (p. 56).

Many college and university professors must have held views similar to Hutchins's because in almost all the cases, the college teacher is selected on the basis of academic preparation in his specialty and personal traits as judged by the college dean or department chairman, and he is not expected to have had any preparation in educational theories and teaching methods (Woodring, 1957). In fact, many professors believe that almost everything else can be learned from systematically gathered knowledge, but not how to teach (Epstein, 1973). However, considering the very small difference in age and learning patterns between high school seniors and college freshmen, it would be hard to convince people that the 12th-grade teacher must go through a course of professional studies and practice teaching and hold a state certificate, while the teacher of college freshmen does not need such requirements.

I find that this situation parallels American's concern over democracy and education. One finds a great reservoir of literature on the important relationship between democracy and K-12 education and how teachers should function as the key elements in training tomorrow's citizens for a democracy. But such training, as is the case with the training of teachers, seems to stop at the K-12 level. Very few scholars have explored the vital relationship between democracy and higher education; even fewer discussed

how university professors should be trained to have the moral standards and professional skills for college teaching. In reality, we all know that some professors are better than others because of their teaching skills. However, most professors are perhaps too arrogant to admit the deficiency in their teaching expertise, not to mention arranging and taking certain courses to overcome this deficiency.

A few scholars have boldly argued that effective teaching on the college level will be governed by the same basic learning principles as is teaching in the elementary or secondary school (Lindsey, 1961), and that prospective professors need work in teaching methods and educational theories as well (Lieberman, 1956; Woodring, 1957). Furthermore, the need for in-service growth of college teachers has been stressed by some reformers (Commission on Teacher Education, 1946; Joyce and Clift, 1984), on the ground that if professors do not exemplify the same continual work on their teaching and personal growth that they expect of teacher candidates and school personnel, then they are undermining their own message by example. This is an important but often neglected point in teacher education reform. Many studies have found that teachers teach as they were taught during their many years as students. Teacher educators and professors in other departments can establish very different professional attitudes and teaching styles in school teacher candidates.

Despite the problems and obstacles in developing the professional education of teachers, a knowledge base for the teaching profession has been gradually built up by reformers in this century. Scholars in this

area believe that there truly exists a body of knowledge named the "science and the art of teaching." There have been some variations on the definition of terms. The early educators regard the science of teaching as the foundation theories in education and the art of teaching as the technical ability and skills (Tarbell, 1895; Aspenwall, 1902),; while Gage, a modern reformer, distinguishes between a science of teaching and a scientific basis for the art of teaching--the former being erroneous because a profession is not in itself a science, it merely has scientific bases (1978, 17-18). Gage suggests that the strength of the scientific knowledge a profession has is essential in improving the profession. He claims that research on teaching is in a stage similar to the six-year pre-penicillin stage of medicine--one in which the necessary knowledge and understanding must accumulate so that breakthroughs can be exploited. Gage urges teacher educators to look for indirect help from research in related fields, and demands teachers to go beyond the scientific basis as they go about their work.

The biggest breakthrough in the study of the knowledge base of teaching in recent years is Smith's A Design for a School of Pedagogy (1980). Smith concluded that all the previous teacher education reformers had failed to give primary consideration to the knowledge base of pedagogical education. In his creative design study, he used "pedagogy" to mean both the act of teaching and the art and science of education. Smith divides pedagogical knowledge into two types--the academic and the clinical. The academic pedagogical knowledge consists of the definitions, principles, facts, and

values that derive from the disciplines of history, philosophy, sociology, psychology, anthropology, economics, and so on. It can be used as the wellspring of educational policies and programs. Clinical knowledge typically constitutes methods courses and consists of teacher-behavior variables and student-behavior variables that teachers manipulate in instruction. For further understanding of these variables, one can look into the following sources of information: the 1929 Commonwealth Teacher-Training Study, which summarizes 25 teachers' traits and 1,010 educators' activities; Gage's discussion of four process variables--warmth, indirectness, cognitive organization, and enthusiasm (1972) and comparative analysis of variables and paradigms of teaching (1978); and Dunkin and Biddle's exposition of presage variables, context variables, process variables, and product variables (1974).

Smith, in his design study, also expounded the two major instructing modes--didactics and heuristics. He concluded from recent research that "students who are taught didactically are just as effective at problem solving and have just as good attitudes toward themselves and the school as students who are taught heuristically" (1980, 96). This conclusion seems to have added, rather than solved, another riddle to the knowledge of teaching and learning. Should our future teachers be masters of one or the other or both instructional modes?

Many other reformers have proposed similar (yet not as clear and comprehensive as Smith's) organization of professional knowledge in the past, (U.S.O.E., 1933; Woodring, 1957; Lindsey, 1961; Conant, 1963; Howe,

1973; Howsam et al., 1976). Some scholars suspect that relying on other fields for its principal substance may hinder the development of the education profession's own knowledge base and technique (Koerner, 1963). But in reality, many strong professions, such as business and medicine, also heavily rely on other fields for their principal substance. The difference lies in the way a profession organizes various branches of related knowledge to serve the purpose of the profession. For education, the teachers should try to master the major forms of knowledge and ways of initiating students into these forms. This is what Donna H. Kerr (1986) calls "interpretation on two levels": first, it requires teachers to understand the subject disciplines as modes of interpretation; second, it renders the principal pedagogical task as that of interpreting the subject discipline as itself a mode of interpretation. Teachers should be able to acquire, through vigorous pedagogical exercises, expertise in these interpretations, which can qualify them as expert educators and distinguish them from the laymen.

To summarize, encouraging progress has been made toward building a solid knowledge base for pedagogical education, although there is still no overwhelming consensus on the form and content of this knowledge. However, since we have a great deal more professional knowledge now than before and than many of the practices in classrooms would lead us to believe, both pre-service and in-service teachers should be taught and encouraged to use as many as possible of the presently available principles, practices, and theories in teaching. Teacher educators should also try to ally research

and knowledge production more closely with knowledge utilization. In the long-run, building a strong and solid body of pedagogical knowledge is still the key to improving teacher education.

Organization of Programs

Since Russell's curriculum reform in 1900, teacher education programs in the U.S. have not changed much from the four components proposed by Russell: general culture or liberal education, special scholarship or subject studies, professional knowledge, and technical skills (See the program descriptions and recommendations in Learned and Bagley, 1920; U.S.O.E., 1933; Commission on Teacher Education, 1946; Woodring, 1957; Tyler, 1958; Lindsey, 1961; Conant, 1963; Cremin, 1977; National Commission for Excellence in Teacher Education, 1985).

There are, however, variations around this core program in different decades. For example, in the 1920s and 1930s, there was a rapid increase in the emphasis placed upon methods of teaching, practice teaching, and related courses in education and psychology; and practice teaching and training school were considered as the central feature of program organization. During the same period, there was in teacher training an emphasis on special problems in rural and negro education. Reformers promoted "differentiated curricula" for teachers--the rural, the elementary, and secondary (U.S.O.E., 1933). Later on, many education reformers argued forcefully that there should be no difference between the basic training requirements for elementary and for secondary school teachers.

In 1946, the Commission on Teacher Education recommended that education in the expressive arts become a part of general as well as of professional education. This is a valuable and important suggestion because skills in artistic expression can enrich teachers' instruction in many ways and enable them to better communicate with children who are more responsive to other than verbal symbols. However, this point has been ignored by most other reform studies. It should be reemphasized today.

Perhaps the most lasting and fierce quarrel among teacher educators and reformers in their organization of programs is about the relationship between the liberal and the technical. Most of the early normal schools were dedicated to the single-purpose professional training, although some schools offered highly academic programs in order to attract more students. Borrowman (1956) pointed out that many of the early normal-school people were so concerned to create a professional sequence that they largely neglected general education and permitted it to develop chaotically. By the 1930s, the feeling had gained ground that a teacher should have a rich academic background before ever attempting any sort of professional work. General education proposed in the 1930s and 1940s was based upon the social and individual needs of students (U.S.O.E., 1933; Commission on Teacher Education, 1946). This was in accordance with the problem-oriented core curriculum in common schools at that time.

The real controversy over the liberal and the technical began in the 1950s. Borrowman (1965) summarized three sets of prevailing attitudes regarding the relationship between liberal and professional studies:

(1) the purists' attitude, which favored a four-year liberal education followed by a fifth year of highly professional training; (2) the integrated set, which assumed that the lines between the general and professional sequences were hard to draw and that the two elements could complement each other, thus courses should be arranged to achieve both liberal and technical ends; (3) the eclectic or ad hoc approach, which granted a distinction between liberal and professional education but assumed that both should take place early in student's collegiate career and continue to run parallel throughout undergraduate and graduate programs.

What, then, were the recommended organizing patterns for liberal and professional education as a result of this controversy? Woodring (1957) observed that four major patterns were proposed: (1) that a fifth year of professional training and experience be provided for liberal arts graduates (a great majority of colleges preferred this pattern); (2) that liberal arts colleges incorporate essential professional training into their programs; (3) that universities devise new programs that represent the best thinking of both academic and professional faculties; and (4) that teachers colleges be assisted in providing better liberal arts programs and in reorganizing their professional courses.

By the 1960s, reformers had acquired the firm belief that at least half of the total programs for future teachers should be devoted to general education (Conant, 1963), and that elements of general education should permeate the whole program and become teachers' lifetime objective

(Lindsey, 1961). The beliefs and organized program patterns about general and professional education in the 1950s and 1960s have persisted into the 1970s and 1980s. The NCATE standards require that at least one-third of each curriculum for prospective teachers be devoted to general education component (Friedman et al., 1980). This is less than that recommended by reformers in the 1950s and 1960s. On the whole, the American scholars in modern times are a bit too obssessed with general education. This obsession has sometimes detracted necessary attention from other components of teacher training, especially it has often overshadowed the development of pedagogical education. A more balanced view on the liberal and the technical is needed for future reforms.

Another influential movement affecting the organization of teacher-training programs is the widespread acceptance and development of systematic performance-or competency-based teacher education (PBTE) in recent years. PBTE establishes behaviors as objectives and uses these specified objectives as criteria in assessing students' progress toward teaching competence. Many teacher educators do not accept this model because they believe that teaching is in reality something more than the aggregate of specific behaviors. However, PBTE has been adopted in one form or another by institutions in every state. Harberman (1975) observed that such rapid adoption would have never been possible had it not been supported by the public pressure for greater accountability for classroom teachers. The curriculum and effects of PBTE will have to be taken into serious consideration in reorganization of programs.

Graduate programs in education did not exist until the turn of the present century. In the 1930s, only 142 institutions across the nation offered courses in education on the graduate level (U.S.O.E., 1933); today 884, or 66 percent, of all teacher training institutions have graduate programs. In the past thirty years or so, some educators have advocated the idea of eliminating undergraduate majors in education and establishing graduate professional school of education (Goodlad, 1958; Koerner, 1963; Smith, 1980; Joyce and Clift, 1984). It should be noted that there is a difference between eliminating undergraduate majors in education and moving teacher preparation to the graduate level. The latter has been one of the major recommendations by both the Holmes Group and the Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy.

The graduate courses in the earlier years were concentrated in nine areas: principles and philosophy of education, history of education, educational sociology, educational psychology, tests and measurements, administration, supervision, methods, and research. However, the number of specialties and subspecialties had grown astronomically to over 700 in some institutions by the 1960s. Koerner (1963) called for a drastic reduction of the number to five specialties--administration, history of education, philosophy of education, psychology, and comparative education. The quality of graduate programs, faculties, and students in education was often viewed as inferior to other fields of study in the university. The most sharp and sarcastic critique on this topic can be found in Koerner's The Miseducation of American Teachers (1963).

The organization of graduate programs in education based on available knowledge is often looser than that of other professional education programs. Let us take for example the core course requirements for Master of Education degree in Policy, Governance & Administration as compared with those for MBA degree in the University of Washington (see the recent program descriptions of the two areas). Comparatively speaking, the MBA core courses are more rigorous, integrated and intense than the M.E. program. The business school also requires that the entering class be divided into four large groups with 45 students in each one, and that each group of students take all the core courses together as a cohort in the first year. This can not only help maintain a high level of coordination and integration of the program, but also effectively socialize students into the norms of the profession. The MBA course contents are also based on different disciplines of knowledge as education courses. It is the way of organizing the program that makes a difference.

In-service education is perhaps more important for the teaching profession than for many other professions. The organization of in-service teacher training programs has always been a concern of teacher educators. The earliest form of in-service education was the summer school, which afforded teachers special out-of-term work in professional education or in academic or technical subject matter (U.S.O.E., 1933). Later on, group study, local conferences, and short-term seminars were proposed and arranged for teachers in service (Commission on Teacher Education, 1946; Conant, 1963). However, today, the modal form of in-service education

still appears to be either lecture-discussion or workshop format. Howey (1983) suggests that more research should be conducted to develop various forms of advisory approaches, psychological consultation, clinical supervision, organizational development, cooperative problem solving, child study, modeling behavior, observation and feedback, and self-directed instruction. Some reformers have also proposed sabbatical year for teachers in service (Brubacher, 1913; Merit Pay Task Force, 1983). Assuming that college professors and school teachers are in the same profession of teaching, why should only the former enjoy sabbatical leave?

At present, the prospect of reorganizing teacher education programs is encouraging. According to AACTE's 1984 "Report to the Profession," 65 percent of the teacher training institutions are practically redesigning their courses to more clearly reflect research on teaching. However, we may need some curriculum designers to work on the whole of a curriculum, to consider interrelationships among the parts, and to examine the parts for balance and completeness. As Lindsey (1973) observes, many teacher educators have devoted almost all their time, energy, and thought to producing bits and pieces of programs but there have been too few curriculum designers who work on the whole.

In the process of reorganization, it is important to place emphasis upon fundamental studies in education and to incorporate new elements--cultural plualism and global awareness--into the old assumptions about democracy and education. A second consideration should be given to the inclusion of a greater variety of ways of knowing into the program.

Finally, more attention should be paid to the relationship between the "what" and "how" in the program and the actual classroom practice.

Quality Controls

How to control and improve the quality of teacher education has always been a matter of great concern to reformers. Some of the major chronic issues are: accreditation, selection and admission, certification, and evaluation.

Before the mid-1920s, standards for the accreditation of teacher education programs in the U.S. were matters of discussion rather than reality. Early in 1926, however, the American Association of Teachers Colleges had adopted standards for the accreditation of teachers colleges and was in the business of accrediting teacher education programs. Since then, three chief agencies for accreditation have been developed--state departments of education, regional accreditating associations, and the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). By the end of the 1940s, many liberal arts colleges and universities had already been accredited for teacher education. The NCATE's accreditation played a significant role in determining eligibility for federal funds. It also contributed to effective enforcement of standards in teacher preparation (Lindsey, 1961). However, it did not assume responsibility for assisting institutions in their self-improvement, and very often its structure and process of decision making, its difficulties in organizing

competent visiting teams, and its ambiguous standards generated great dissatisfaction among teacher educators and the public. Therefore, in 1963, Conant proposed a reorganization of NCATE and redefined its function as an advisory body to teacher-preparing institutions and local school boards.

As teacher education became more innovative and multifaceted in the 1970s, the NCATE accepted regional accreditation of a total institution and resigned itself to the job of special program accreditation. Some reformers set out to search for the alternatives to rising NCATE costs and to reconsider the purpose and procedures of accreditation (Howsam et al., 1976). They asserted that the fundamental purpose of accreditation should be to inspire adequate and safe minimum standards, and that the accreditation processes must place major emphasis upon the products of training programs. Others have proposed to restrict accreditation to knowledge-producing institutions that are linked to experimental school sites (Joyce and Clift, 1984). This recommendation, if implemented, would reduce the current 1,340 teacher training institutions in the country to 200 to 300. Naturally, it will not be welcomed by most institutions.

Recruitment, selection, and admission are also directly related to quality control of teacher education. From the very beginning, American educators understood that teaching did not require genius, but it did require good health, good personality, good scholarship, and devotion to the work of teaching (Tarbell, 1895; U.S.O.E., 1933; Commission on Teacher Education, 1946; Lindsey, 1961). Recommendations have been made throughout

the past century to identify and recruit talented persons from graduating high school classes, liberal arts majors, or professionals seeking mid-career changes (see for example, U.S.O.E., 1933; Commission on Teacher Education, 1946; Conant, 1963; Boyer, 1983; National Commission on Excellence in Teacher Education, 1985). Many reformers have proposed setting up different kinds of loans and scholarships to attract capable teacher candidates (Conant, 1963; Boyer, 1983; Merit Pay Task Force, 1983; California Commission on the Teaching Profession, 1985).

An unusual recommendation about admission was made by Smith in 1980. He suggested that the admission procedure should include a ritual to impress upon students that they are asking for a chance to serve humankind in the oldest and most honorable profession. Yet this may not work on most of the American campuses where such rituals may offend people's sense of freedom. And after all, oral commitment often does not mean commitment by heart, which can only result from great confidence in a cause, not from one or two rituals.

As for the recruitment and selection of school administrators, very few reform studies have given special attention to the subject or provided clues on how to select effective public school administrators. The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education identified in its study (1973) the insights and skills a school administration candidate should have, and recommended that special efforts should be made to recruit into the profession able administrators from outside the field as well as members of minority groups and women. Goodlad (1984) also stresses this issue and has

urged school districts to put effort and investment in the cause of identifying employees with leadership potential. Since school administrators often play important roles in school improvement, selection, and training of such personnel should receive more attention in educational research and reform.

Another quality control mechanism is the certification process. Certification of teachers in some form has existed almost from the beginning of organized elementary schools. It has developed from local, nonprofessional control to that of state control. Today, many education reformers still hold that certification should be a state responsibility in consultation with the profession. However, professional representation--involvement of teachers in the certification process--has always been found to be a problem by reformers (see for example, Lieberman, 1956; Lindsey, 1961; Howsam et al., 1976). Most recently, the Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy has proposed to create a National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, organized with a regional and state membership structure, to establish high standards for what teachers need to know and be able to do, and to certify teachers who met that standard (1986). This may get into conflict with the traditional idea and practice that certification is a state responsibility.

The recurring argument over the issue of certification seems to be whether certification should be a lifelong license (U.S.O.E., 1933; Howsam et al., 1976; Joyce and Clift, 1984). Reformers discovered a long time ago that permanent certification was incompatible with modern educational

philosophy and practice. Nevertheless, they have not found a better alternative to replace it and to develop a lifelong professional educational system. Maybe the five-stage teacher certification process being proposed by the Holmes Group can provide a model to solve the problem. Since the certification process, requirements and outcomes have powerful influence over teacher preparation curriculum; no real change in the curriculum is possible before we resolve the main issues around certification.

Like certification, evaluation is also a key element in the quality control of teacher education. The early reformers largely were puzzled over the criteria of evaluation--for example, whether the length or the proportion of the professional course should be the criterion for evaluating teacher-preparing programs (U.S.O.E., 1933). By the 1940s, it was recognized that evaluation could play an important role in pre-service teacher education, and that prospective teachers should learn to evaluate their own strengths and weaknesses and to help children to do the same (Commission on Teacher Education, 1946).

In 1957, Woodring identified the essential problem of evaluation as the inadequate understanding of the effectiveness of traditional programs, and proposed that programs of teacher education be evaluated at any of three levels: judgment about the program itself, judgment of the competence of the teachers who graduate from the program, and evaluation of the learning of the children taught by these teachers. He noted that although the last level of evaluation really got to the heart of the problem, it was the most difficult to perform, for it required effective control of a vast

number of variables, many of which were not easily measurable (1957, 61-69). Unfortunately, Woodring's worry seemed to be ignored by many hard and tough reformers who have actively promoted the accountability system, which takes care of the easily measurable variables (scores from SAT and other standardized tests, etc.) of children's learning all right, but totally disregards the more important, but difficult to measure variables such as school climate and teacher-student interaction.

In the last 30 years, evaluation has gradually emerged as a new field of study within the social and behavioral sciences, and its methodologies have become more diversified and complicated. New methods for educational evaluation--computerized data collection and analysis, appraisal and dissemination through institutional network, etc.--have been tried out and developed.

Some researchers have begun to conceive the meaning of evaluation quite differently from the conventional viewpoint. They are more concerned with the contextual and qualitative variables and the process of evaluation itself. Recently, Kennith Sirotnik (1986) argued that evaluation should become the process of rigorous self-examination, the process of critical inquiry, and the process of institutional renewal. Evaluation conceived and practiced as such may serve as an effective vehicle to control and improve the quality of public schooling and teacher education, and to transform the passive nature of teaching in public schools.

Authority and Responsibility

Teacher education reformers frequently encounter the issues of who should control teacher-training institutions and programs, and what authority and responsibility the teaching profession should have. The early reformers concluded from the "best American experience" that a board appointed at large for long terms, unpaid, and representing high and varied ability was the most successful form of educational control yet devised for a democratic community (Learned and Bagley, 1920). However, by the middle of the century, this "single board," which evolved into the state department of education, together with the accrediting associations, the professional associations and the institutions themselves, had produced an excessive concentration of power (Koerner, 1963). Modern reformers therefore have called for a better balance of centralization and decentralization, and recommended that responsibility for teacher education in the state be delegated to the teaching profession and to the colleges and universities, with the state providing only the needed support services (Howsam et al., 1976).

A heated argument among reformers on the issue of authority and responsibility concerns the question of whether the university as a whole should be responsible for teacher education. Bestor (1955) asserted that the training of teachers for the public schools was one of the most important functions of the American university, thus it ought always to be the responsibility of the university as a whole. Similar argument has been made by Tyler (1958), Conant (1963), and the Carnegie Commission on Higher

Education (1973). In reality, many universities have not assumed appropriate and caring responsibilities for SCDEs. This has been reflected in obvious ways: below average resource allocations, vulnerability in periods of enrollment decline, difficulty in initiating new programs, and difficulty in providing rewards to faculty (Clark and Guba, 1980). There has always been a lot of tension between SCDEs and central university administration, and between SCDEs and other departments on the campus.

With regard to authority and responsibility on the teacher's part, American educators seem to agree unanimously, at least in theory, that the authority and responsibility of educating should be delegated to the teachers. However, as early as 1903, John Dewey noted the inconsistency between basic democratic theory and the practice in the school. He identified the ethical principle upon which democracy rests as the "r_sponsibility and freedom of mind in discovery and truth." Yet as he looked into the schools, he found that teachers largely were excluded from making decisions on curriculum, textbooks, methods, and many other educational issues (Dewey, 1903).

This pathetic situation has remained unchanged today, although many reformers have argued for more professional autonomy and responsibility for the teachers (see discussions by Bestor, 1955; Borrowman, 1956; Lieberman, 1956; Kerr, 1986). Donna H. Kerr, in particular, has outlined four major responsibilities a teacher should have in order to exercise his authority of educating: (1) the epistemic responsibility--initiating students into the forms of knowledge or ways of understanding that make sense of experi-

ence; (2) the moral responsibility--helping all students understand the importance of making their own choices as well as on the basis of disciplined beliefs and values; (3) the political responsibility--holding fast to the expectation and goal that every student can and will acquire the disciplined, critical capacities that characterize the educated person; and 4)the professional responsibility--accountability for the maintenance of acceptable standards of expertise within the profession. At present, there is an urgent need to restructure the hierarchical system of schooling and to create necessary conditions under which teachers can assume these responsibilities. On the other hand, teachers should not just wait for others to bring the favorable conditions to them on silver plates, but actively engage themselves in the process of reform. Teacher-training institutions should rebuild their programs so as to better prepare teachers for their future responsibilities.

SCDEs and Public Schools

In a formal organizational sense and in reality, the SCDEs are largely divorced from the public schools in the U.S. Two reasons may account for this separation. One is that teachers in the two institutions have always considered themselves as members of different professions and communicate all too little with each other. Even so, teacher educators are generally looked down upon by their colleagues on university faculties because they are thought to have only the tricks of the public-school trade (Frieden-

berg, 1973). The second reason closely follows the first: since the clearest route to professional success in American universities is through conventional productivity in research and scholarly writing, many SCDE staff members have busied themselves in the study, rather than in the preparation, of teachers in order to get equal recognition from their colleagues in other departments and to "transcend" the tricks of the public-school trade. As a consequence, the gap between research and practice, and between SCDEs and public schools has been widened as research activities advance in modern universities.

This problem has not been passing by unheeded by education reformers in the past. The Commission on Teacher Education recognized in 1946 the mutual benefit of school-college cooperation, and recommended state-wide programs to develop closer relationship and deeper understanding between high school and college staff members. One of the most frequent suggestions for reform in the 1950s was that teacher educators in universities should get out of their ivory towers and establish direct and lasting contact with public schools, because only there could they found anything germane to say about teaching methods and learning styles (Moore, 1958). Reformers also emphasized the participation of public school personnel in planning teacher education curricula, especially practice teaching (Goodlad, 1958; Lindsey, 1961). In the more recent past, teacher education innovators have called for a shift of a good proportion of in-service teacher training from the universities into the schools, because they believe that most important and useful research in education should be done in close touch with the real world of school-children (Howe, 1973).

Perhaps the most promising reform for teacher education and public schooling in our times is the development of the school-university partnership concept and practice. In the past educational reform movements, the SCDEs and schools have often gone on separate paths, although they probe to achieve the inseparable goal of improving the quality of schooling. In the 1970s, reformers actively promoted the "partnership" idea and argued that schools could become genuine partners in teacher education (Cunningham, 1973). Yet it is only during the last few years that the partnership concept has been more carefully developed and put into practice. Goodlad (1986) well illustrates the the mutually beneficial relationships between schools and universities:

> For schools to get better, they must have better teachers, among other things. To prepare better teachers (and counselors, special educators, and administrators) universities must have access to school settings exhibiting the very best practices. To assure the best practices, schools must have ongoing access to alternative ideas and knowledge. For universities to have access to exemplary settings and for these settings to become and remain exemplary, the schools and the preparing institutions must enjoy the symbiotic relationships of joining together as equal partners. (p. 8-9)

Currently, a few promising networks of school-university partnerships are being developed across the country under the coordination of the National Center for Educational Renewal. The ACCTE in its 1984 study of 499 teacher-training institutions found that about 75 percent of them were engaged in building partnerships with elementary/secondary schools to improve quality of teaching and teacher education.

Several other new trends in educational research and reform can be considered as the supporting stones for the partnership concept and practice: the bottom-up approach for change (Cunningham, 1973; Goodlad, 1984); reorganization of the school as a center of inquiry (Schaefer, 1967; Wilson, 1972); teachers as innovators and researchers (Joyce, 1972; and Erickson, 1986); inquiry as an organizing principle for teaching (Gideonse, 1983); and inquiry-based teacher education (Case and Matthes, 1985). In fact, the school-university partnership model has been trying to incorporate the essential elements of these research and reform paradigms in its development. It can be expected that this model will make significant contributions to the building of a large number of self-renewing schools and teacher-training institutions in the near future.

Concluding Note

It is clear from the above review that teacher education reform has always been a concern and necessity in the U.S. However, until today, we cannot find a viable model of truly professional school for the education of educators. There are no blueprints to follow. Many of the chronic issues and recommendations to resolve them simply repeat themselves through the decades.

This situation has provoked thoughtful scholars to look for the obstacles to change. Goodlad (1986) suggests that one of the most significant obstacles could be that too many of us like things the way they are.

This is true for both school teachers and teacher educators; the former are known for their conservative attitude and support for the existing structure, organization, and purposes of school (Lortie, 1975), and the latter are known for their sense of complacency (Friedman et al., 1980). School teachers, especially, are often seen as the "silent partners." Most of the reform efforts to reconstruct schools in the past have been initiated by college professors rather than by school teachers themselves.

How to overcome this inertia should be on the front page of current reform agenda. Herbert A. Thelen (1973) has asserted that the only way to generate and develop a profession is through interactions and communications among the various parts. "Communication," then, seems to be the magic word to open the gate of treasure--the potentials for restructuring schooling and teacher education. Therefore, instead of working on another laundry list of chronic issues and fancy recommendations, we should perhaps begin our new reform in schools and SCDEs by a simple but sincere calling: "Let's talk!"

(170)D

REFERENCES

Aspenwall, Wm. B. "The Necessity of Professional Training for Teachers." Education XXIII (1902): 27-31.

Bestor, A. The Restoration of Learning. New York: Alfred Knopf, 1955.

Book, C., J. Byers, and D. Freeman. "Student Expectations and Teacher Education Traditions With with Which We Can and Cannot Live." Journal of Teacher Education 34, No. 1: 9-13.

Borrowman, M. L. The Liberal and Technical in Teacher Education. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1956.

----- (ed.) Teacher Education in America. New York: Teachers College Press, 1965.

-----. "Teacher Education: History." In The Encyclopedia of Education. New York: Macmillan, 1971.

Boyer, Ernest. High School. New York: Harper and Row, 1983.

Boykin, J. C., and Roberta King. The Tangible Rewards of Teaching. U.S. Bureau of Education Bulletin, No. 16. Washington D.C.: U.S. Bureau of Education, 1914.

Brubacher. In "Educational News and Editorial Comment." The ElementarySchool Teacher 50 (October 1913).

California Commission on the Teaching Profession. Who Will Teach Our Children? California: The Author, 1985.

The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. Continuity and Discontinuity. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973.

Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy. A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century. Report of the Task Force on Teaching as a Profession of the Forum. New York: The forum, 1986.

Case, Charles W., and William A. Matthes. "Colleges of Education: The Profession, Human Services, and the Future." In Colleges of Education, edited by Charles W. Case and William A. Mathes. Berkeley, Cal.: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1985.

Charters, W. W., and Douglas Waples. The Commonwealth Teacher-Training Study. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1929.

Clark, David L., and Egon G. Guba. A Study of Teacher Education Institutions as Innovators, Knowledge Producers and Change Agencies. Washington D.C.: National Institute of Education, 1977.

-----. "Schools, Colleges, and Departments of Education: Demographic and Contextual Features." In The Dilemma of the Deanship, edited by Daniel E. Griffiths and Donald J. McCarty. Danville, Ill.: The Interstate Printers and Publishers, 1980.

Commission on Teacher Education. Teachers for Our Times. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1944.

-----. The Improvemant of Teacher Education. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1946.

Commissioner of Common Schools in Ohio. "Report of the Commissioner of Common Schools." In The Professional Preparation of Teachers for American Public Schools, edited by William S. Learned et al. New York: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1920.

Committee on Normal Schools. "Normal Schools: Report of Committee to the National Council of Education." Normal Schools, March 1884, pp. 435-39.

Conant, James B. The Education of American Teachers. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1963.

Cremin, Lawrence. The Education of the Educating Profession. Washington, D.C.: The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1977.

Cunningham, Luvern L. "Effecting Reform in a College of Education." In New Perspectives on Teacher Education, edited by Donald J. McCarty. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1973.

Dewey, John. "Democracy in Education." The Elementary School Teacher, 4 (December 1903): 193-204.

Dunkin, N. J., and B. J. Biddle. The Study of Teaching. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1974.

Edson, A. W. "Professional Improvement." Education XX, No. 3 (November 1899): 129-136.

Epstein, Leon D. "Liberal Arts Perspective." In New Perspectives on Teacher Education, edited by Donald J. McCarty. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1973.

Erickson, Frederick. "Qualitative Methods in Research on Teaching." In Handbook of Research on Teaching, 3rd ed., edited by Merlin Wittrock. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, 1986.

Friedenberg, Edgar Z. "The Question in Teacher Education." In New Perspectives on Teacher Education, edited by Donald J. McCarty. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Publishers, 1973.

Friedman, Myles I., Patricia S. Brinlee, and Patricia B. Dennis Hayes. Improving Teacher Education. New York: Longman, 1980.

Gage, N. L. Teacher Effectiveness and Teacher Education: The Search for a Scientific Basis. Palo Alto, Calif.: Pacific Books, 1972.

-----. The Scientific Basis of the Art of Teaching. New York: Teachers College Press, 1978.

Gideonse, H. "The Necessary Revolution in Teacher Education," Phi Delta Kappan, September 1982, pp. 15-18.

-----. In Search of More Effective Service. Cincinnati, Ohio: S. Rosenthal & Co., 1983.

Goodlad, John I. "Teacher Education Beyond the Crossroads." In The Education of Teachers: New Perspectives. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1958.

-----. A Place Called School. New York: MaGraw-Hill Book Co., 1984.

-----. "Reconstructing Schooling and the Education of Educators: The Partnership Concept." In The Ecology of School Improvement, edited by John I. Goodlad. Yearbook of the NSSE. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987.

-----. "Elements of a Vital Teacher Education Program." General session address presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Chicago, Feburary 1986.

Haberman, Martin. "Perspectives on Tomorrow's Teacher Education." In NSSE's Teacher Education, The 74th Yearbook. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1975.

Hanus, Paul H. "Papers on the Professional Preparation of High-School Teachers." Journal of Proceedings and Addresses of NEA, 1907, pp. 563-77.

-----. "The Professional Training of the Teacher." Journal of Education, LXVIL, No. 1 (January 1908): 8.

Holmes Group. Tomorrow's Teachers. East Lansing, Mich.: Holmes Group, Inc. 1986.

Howe, Harold, II. "Improving Teacher Education Through Exposures to Reality." In New Perspectives on Teacher Education, edited by Donald J. McCarty. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Publishers, 1973.

Howey, Kenneth R. "Teacher Education: An Overview." In The Education of Teachers, edited by Kenneth R. Howey and William E. Gardner. New York: Longman, 1983.

Howsam, Robert B. et al. Educating a Profession. Washington, D.C.: AACTE, 1976.

Hutchins, Robert M. The Higher Learning in America. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1940.

Joyce, Bruce. "The Teacher Innovator: A Program for Preparing Educators." In Perspectives for Reform in Teacher Education, edited by Bruce Joyce and Marsha Weil. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1972.

Joyce, Bruce, and Renee Clift. "The Phoenix Agenda: Essential Reform in Teacher Education." Educational Researcher, April 1984, pp. 5-19.

Judd, Charles H. "The Carnegie Survey of Normal Schools." The Elementary School Journal, XXI, No. 1, (September 1920): 47-51.

Kerr, Donna H. "Teaching Competence and Teacher Education in the United States." Teachers College Record 84 (1983): 525-52.

-----. "Authority and Responsibility in Public Schooling." In The Ecology of School Improvement, edited by John I. Goodlad. Yearbook of the NSSE. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987.

Koerner, James D. The Miseducation of American Teachers. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1963.

-----. "Governance of Teacher Education." In New Perspectives on Teacher Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Publishers, 1973.

Learned, William S., and William C. Bagley, eds. The Professional Preparation of Teachers for American Public Schools. New York: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1920.

Lieberman, M. Education as a Profession. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1956.

Lindsey, Margaret, ed. New Horizons for the Teaching Profession. Washington, D.C.: D. C.: National Education Association, 1961.

Lortie, D. C. Schoolteacher: A Sociological Study. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1975.

Luckey, G. W. A. "The Essentials in the Training of a Teacher." School and Society, February 20, 1915, pp. 263-69.

Merit Pay Task Force. Merit Pay Task Force Report. Prepared for the Committee on Education and Labor House of Representatives. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1983.

Moore, Hollis A. "Elements in the Teacher Education Program: Professional Preparation." In The Education of Teachers: New Perspectives. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1958.

National Commission for Excellence in Teacher Education. "A Call for Change in Teacher Education." The Chronicle of Higher Education, March 6, 1985, pp. 13-21.

National Society for the Study of Education. Teacher Education: The 74th Yearbook. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1975.

Schaefer, Robert J. The School as a Center of Inquiry. New York: Harper and Row, 1967.

Schlechty, Phillip C., and Victor S. Vance. "Do Academically Able Teachers Leave Education? The North Carolina Case." Phi Delta Kappan, October 1981, pp. 106-112.

Sirotnik, Kenneth. "Evaluation in the Ecology of Schooling: The Process of School Renewal." In The Ecology of School Improvement, edited by John I. Goodlad. Yearbook of the NSSE. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987.

Smith, B. O. A Design for a School of Pedagogy. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1980.

Smith, David C., ed. Essential Knowledge for Beginning Educators. Washington, D.C.: AACTE, 1983.

Tarbell, H. S. "Report of the Sub-Committee on the Training of Teachers." Journal of Proceedings and Addresses of the NEA, 1895, pp. 238-53.

Thelen, Herbert A. "Profession Anyone?" In New Perspectives on Teacher Education, edited by Donald J. McCarty. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Publishers, 1973.

Tyler, Ralph W. "The Education of Teachers: A Major Responsibility of Colleges and Universities." In The Education of Teachers: New Perspectives. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1958.

U.S. Department of the Interior, Office of Education. National Survey of the Education of Teachers, U.S.O.E. Bulletin, No. 10, 6 Vols. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1933.

Wilson, Elizabeth G. "Can the School Become a Center of Inquiry? A Design Institution Building." In Perspectives for Reform in Teacher Education. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1972.

Woodring, Paul. New Directions in Teacher Education. New York: The Fund for the Advancement of Education, 1957.